

REMARKS

The Office Action dated March 7, 2006, has been received and carefully considered. In this response, claims 1, 10, 13 and 22 have been amended, and claims 2 and 14 have been cancelled without prejudice. Entry of the amendments to the claims 1, 10, 13 and 22, and the cancellation of claims 2 and 14 without prejudice is respectfully requested. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is also respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

I. THE OBVIOUSNESS REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-24

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-15, 18-21, 23 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pickering (U.S. Patent No. 6,628,666) in view of Oran (U.S. Patent No. 6,275,574), and further in view of Allain (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,259). On page 5 of the Office Action, claims 4 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pickering, in view of Oran, and further in view of Allain. On page 5 of the Office Action, claims 5 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pickering, in view of Oran, in view of Allain, and further in view of Bridgman (U.S. Patent No. 6,523,062). On page 6 of the Office Action, claims 10 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pickering,

in view of Oran, in view of Allain, and further in view of Kuthyar (U.S. Patent No. 5,768,513). These rejections are hereby respectfully traversed.

Regarding claims 1 and 13, the Examiner asserts that Pickering teaches "a first interface (interface between telephone and computer) to a telephone device (col. 5, lines 60-col. 6, line 12); a second interface (internet interface or telephone interface) to at least one communication link (col. 5, line 60-col. 6, line 12); and a host (ref. 202: computer), communicating with the first interface and the second interface, the host, after receiving a call initiation via a first interface, selectively initiating a call from the network-enabled telephone device as at least one of a telephone call and a data connection via the at least one communications link and a data connection via the at least one communications link according to at least one transmission criterion.

Although Applicant does not agree with the pending rejection, Applicant has nonetheless amended each of the independent claims to recite a feature and functionality not disclosed by the cited references. In particular, Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 13 to respectively incorporate the recitations of claims 2 and 14, namely: "an SIP-enabled telephone device."

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Pickering nor Oran -- alone or in combination -- teaches or suggests any feature or functionality comprising an SIP-enabled telephone device, as recited in independent claims 1 and 13.

Indeed, Applicant respectfully submits that the excerpt relied upon by the Examiner merely discloses various signaling protocols, but not an SIP-enabled telephone device:

VoIP uses H.323, *Session Initiation Protocol & Session Description Protocol (SIP+SDP)*, Simple Gateway Control Protocol (SGCP), Media Gateway Control Protocol (MGCP) and many other types of signaling protocols.

See Oran, Col. 1, lines 27-32 (emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that the above excerpt does not teach or suggest an SIP-enabled telephone device, as required by each of the independent claims, as amended. In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that merely disclosing a SIP+SDP session protocol does not teach or suggest an SIP-enabled telephone device as claimed by the pending claims.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that none of the other cited references -- namely Allain, Bridgman and Kuthyar -- make up for Pickering and Oran's deficiencies in this regard. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 13, as amended, are allowable over the cited references.

Claims 2-12 and 14-24 are dependent upon independent claim 1 or 13. Thus, since independent claims 1 and 13 should be allowable as discussed above, claims 2-12 and 14-24 should also be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claim 1 or 13. Moreover, these claims recite additional features which are not claimed, disclosed, or even suggested by the cited references taken either alone or in combination. For example, claim 3 recites wherein the first interface comprises a USB connection. Applicant respectfully submits that none of the cited references, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the system of claim 1 wherein the first interface comprises a USB connection.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the aforementioned anticipation rejection of claims 1-24 be withdrawn.

## II. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number, in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the

Patent Application  
Attorney Docket No.: 56130.000011  
Client Reference No.: 11889RRUS01U

present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to

Patent Application  
Attorney Docket No.: 56130.000011  
Client Reference No.: 11889RRUS01U

Deposit Account No. 50-0206, and please credit any excess fees  
to the same deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

Hunton & Williams LLP

By: 

Ozzie A. Farres

Registration No. 43,606

TEA/OAF/dja

Hunton & Williams LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109  
Telephone: (202) 955-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 778-2201

Date: June 7, 2006